

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00185 161146Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 NRC-05 ERDE-00 /093 W
----- 035243

P R 161035Z APR 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0950

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0185

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY

REF: (A) USNATO 2024 (NOTAL); (B) USNATO 1996

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. THE DELEGATION RECOMMENDS THAT THE
US SUPPORT THE ITALIAN SUGGESTION TO DELETE FROM THE
DRAFT GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY ALL REFERENCE TO NON-
CIRCUMVENTION, INCLUDING BOTH THE FINAL PHRASE, TO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00185 161146Z

WHICH THE ITALIANS OBJECTED, AND ALSO THE FIRST SENTENCE

OF THE "FORMULATION" IN SECTION II, EVEN IF THE NETHERLANDS DISAGREES. THESE PHRASES IN THE BELGIAN FORMULATION WOULD IN EFFECT CREATE AN ALLIANCE POSITION ON GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION BEFORE ADEQUATE STUDY HAD BEEN GIVEN TO THE QUESTION BY EITHER THE USG OR THE ALLIANCE AS A WHOLE. WE FEAR THAT THIS LANGUAGE WOULD GO FAR ENOUGH TO CREATE THE BASIS FOR SOVIET ACTION AIMED AT RESTRICTING FUTURE US DEPLOYMENT OPTIONS, BUT NOT FAR ENOUGH TO PLACE ANY MEANINGFUL LIMITATION ON THE SOVIET UNION. END SUMMARY.

2. AS WE UNDERSTAND THE US POSITION ON THE FLANK ISSUE, WE WISHED TO AVOID ANY MEANINGFUL RESTRICTIONS ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF US FORCES OUTSIDE THE NGA, WHILE STILL SAYING ENOUGH ON THE FLANK ISSUE TO SATISFY THE NATO FLANKS. SO LONG AS THE EFFORTS OF THE GREEKS AND OTHERS TO SPECIFY A RELEVANT GEOGRAPHICAL AREA ARE RESISTED, A FORMULATION WHICH IS RESTRICTED TO LIMITATIONS ON REDEPLOYMENT OF WITHDRAWN FORCES, AND WHICH LIMITS THE PROHIBITION TO ACTIONS WHICH MIGHT DIMINISH THE SECURITY OF FLANK COUNTRIES, IS REASONABLY SAFE. THIS IS BECAUSE THE DEPLOYMENTS THE US MIGHT MAKE IN ANY CONTINGENCY SHORT OF A MAJOR EAST-WEST CRISIS WOULD PLAINLY BE DIRECTED AGAINST TERRITORIES OTHER THAN THOSE OF BULGARIA, ROMANIA, OR HUNGARY.

3. HOWEVER, TO COUPLE THE PROHIBITION ON REDEPLOYMENTS JEOPARDIZING FLANK SECURITY WITH THE CONCEPT OF GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION LANGUAGE OF THE SORT CONTAINED IN THE BELGIAN PROPOSAL (THE LANGUAGE WHICH WE FAVOR DELETING) WOULD TEND TO PROHIBIT REDEPLOYMENTS WHICH AFFECTED THE OVERALL BALANCE IN EUROPE EVEN IF THEY DID NOT DIRECTLY MENACE A FLANK COUNTRY. FOR EXAMPLE, SUCH LANGUAGE COULD ENABLE THE SOVIETS TO CLAIM THAT US REDEPLOYMENTS IN FRANCE -- IF FRENCH POLICY SHOULD IN THE FUTURE PERMIT THEM -- WERE IN VIOLATION OF THIS CLAUSE OF THE MBFR AGREEMENT. THE SOVIETS MIGHT EVEN CLAIM THAT SUCH LANGUAGE RESTRICTED US REDEPLOYMENTS TO THE UK OR TO SPAIN. THERE IS NO POTENTIAL ADVANTAGE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00185 161146Z

TO COMPENSATE THE WEST FOR THIS RISK, SINCE ANY SOVIET REDEPLOYMENT OF POSSIBLE INTEREST WOULD INTER ALIA MENACE A NATO FLANK STATE.

4. FURTHERMORE, COUPLING NON-CIRCUMVENTION WITH FLANK SECURITY WOULD ALSO UNDERCUT THE EFFORT WE MAY WISH TO MAKE TO IMPOSE SOME LIMITATION, THROUGH A SPECIFIC NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION, ON SOVIET

FORCES IN HUNGARY WHICH IS NOT MATCHED BY A COMPARABLE LIMITATION ON US FORCES IN ITALY. OUR STRONGEST ARGUMENT FOR TREATING HUNGARY AND ITALY DIFFERENTLY IN A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CONTEXT IS THAT HUNGARY IS ADJACENT TO THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WHILE ITALY IS NOT. THIS ARGUMENT WILL LOSE EFFECT IF THE ALLIES MAKE PROPOSALS INDICATING THAT THE NON-CIRCUMVENTION CONCEPT IS AS RELEVANT TO THE FLANKS (INCLUDING ITALY) AS IT IS TO CENTRAL EUROPE.

5. THE ENTIRE SUBJECT OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN MBFR IS ONE WHICH HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY STUDIED EITHER IN THE USG OR IN NATO, AND IT IS LIKELY TO PROVE TO BE A DIFFICULT ONE. IT INVOLVES THE TRICKY QUESTIONS OF DRAFTING A REQUIREMENT IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE SOVIETS CANNOT USE IT AS A BASIS FOR PROTESTING A WIDE VARIETY OF POSSIBLE US AND ALLIED ACTIONS. EVEN FAR-FETCHED EASTERN PROTESTS MIGHT BE DAMAGING IF THEY FURNISHED AN EXCUSE TO ALLIED PARLIAMENTARIANS WHO WISHED FOR OTHER REASONS TO REDUCE THE DEFENSE EFFORT. MOREOVER, WE HAVE NOT YET REACHED DECISIONS ON JUST WHAT WE WANT FROM THE EAST THAT NON-CIRCUMVENTION MIGHT PROVIDE. NON-CIRCUMVENTION HAS NOT BEEN DEFINITELY REJECTED AS THE VEHICLE FOR SECURING:

A) LIMITATIONS ON SOVIET FORCES IN HUNGARY.

B) LIMITATIONS ON ARMAMENTS.

C) PREVENTION OF A TRULY MASSIVE SOVIET BUILD-UP IN THE WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00185 161146Z

6. WE THEREFORE BELIEVE THAT THE "FORMULATION" IN SECTION II OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO REMOVE ALL REFERENCE TO GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION, AND THEREFORE TO APPLY ONLY REPEAT ONLY TO ACTIONS INFRINGING ON THE SECURITY OF THE FLANKS. THIS WOULD MEAN DELETING NOT ONLY THE FINAL PHRASE OF THE FORMULATION AS THE ITALIANS SUGGEST, BUT ALSO DELETING THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE "FORMULATION," WHICH IS A NON-CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE WITHOUT THE WORD "CIRCUMVENTION."

7 SINCE THE NEXT SPC MEETING ON THIS SUBJECT IS NOT UNTIL APRIL 21, WASHINGTON AGENCIES MAY WISH TO AUTHORIZE USNATO TO DISCUSS IN ADVANCE WITH NETHERLANDS REPRESENTATIVES THE DESIRABILITY OF

SEPARATING THE CONCEPT OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION FROM THE
FORMULATION ON FLANK SECURITY.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: INSTRUCTIONS, ALLIANCE, POLICIES, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, NEGOTIATIONS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00185
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750133-0179
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750446/aaaabqxv.tel
Line Count: 171
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 USNATO 2024, 75 (NOTA USNATO 1996
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 08 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <08 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <09 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006